DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 710 FL 014 566

AUTHOR	Gandara, Patricia C.; Samulon, Marta
TITLE	Factors Influencing the Implementation of Language Assistance Programs.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	Rand-N-1940-ED
PUB DATE	Nov 83
NOTE	70p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main St., P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90406-2138 ($7.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Federal Programs; *Federal Regulation; *Government Role; *Limited English Speaking; *Program Implementation; School Districts; Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

A study of the existing local needs, resources, and services for limited English speaking residents of the United States was undertaken to clarify local, state, and federal responsibility for the provision of services. For a small but representative sample consisting of eight school districts serving minority language students, the study provides answers to five questions: (1) What services are being delivered? (2) How do the patterns of service vary by district type? (3) What specific deficiencies in language assistance services are perceived by beneficiary groups and educators? (4) What is the apparent cause of these deficiencies? and (5) Do local beneficiary groups and educators see any need for federal regulation, and if so, what should the rules encompass? Key findings include these: (1) services to language minority students vary enormously among school districts; (2) language assistance services are seldom available in secondary schools despite the growing need; (3) few districts have adequate means for identifying need or assessing when it is appropriate to terminate instruction; (4) districts have serious problems finding qualified teachers and materials for some less common language groups; and (5) programs most favored include those that involve local communities in developing appropriate services. Two broad recommendations are made: that federal regulation is needed to assure that districts do not neglect the education of language minority children, and that the federal government should support research and development to improve language assistance programs. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218710
FL 013 966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This project has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education.

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

Published by The Rand Corporation

PREFACE

This study was initiated to inform federal policymakers about the implementation of the bilingual education regulations proposed in August 1980. A study design was developed to describe the patterns of implementation in a sample of school districts across the country. Before the collection of data began, however, the status of the proposed bilingual regulations underwent a number of changes. In the fall of 1980 implementation of the regulations was postponed indefinitely, and in February 1981 the U.S. Department of Education withdrew the regulations.

During this period the study underwent several changes to make it relevant to the fluctuating status of the regulations and the changing information needs of the Department of Education. Finally, at the conclusion of the study, as the final report was being readied for publication, the Department of Education released a new policy statement on the delivery of language assistance services to limited- and non-English-speaking (LES/NES) students. In effect, the Department stated that local school districts may use any effective method to teach LES/NES children. While the Rand study concludes that some federal guidance and research and development are still necessary, it also concludes that local communities--parents, teachers, students, and school administrators--should have a voice in deciding on program offerings.

This Note is expected to be useful in illuminating the range of factors and opinion that affect the implementation of language assistance programs, the limitations associated with typical programs, and the key areas in which federal leadership is needed.

SUMMARY

Nearly ten years ago, in the case of *Lau v. Nichols*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that children who speak little or no English are entitled to be taught in a language they can understand. Since that time, the federal government has struggled to define school districts' obligations to such children. A series of federal guidelines and draft regulations has addressed such questions as:

- How should limited- and non-English-speaking children be identified--by surname, by country of birth, or by tests of English proficiency?
- How proficient in English can a child be and still be considered limited- or non-English-speaking?
- Must schools provide general instruction in children's native language, or may they place language minority children in regular English-speaking classes where they will be instructed in English?
- Who is to pay the added cost of providing special services for language minority children?

In August 1980, the U.S. Department of Education published draft regulations that would have resolved these questions. It prescribed a rigorous set of tests for English-language proficiency, to be administered by school districts to all foreign-born and minority-language-surname children. Any child found to be more proficient in a foreign language than in English would be entitled to language assistance services, including *bilingual* education, i.e., academic instruction both in the student's native language and in English. Students were to receive bilingual education until they could perform at or above the national average on English-language academic achievement tests.

The proposed rules provoked great controversy, and they were withdrawn by President Reagan in 1981. The controversy was both philosophical--focusing on whether the schools should do anything that might reinforce minority students' use of their native languages--and political--focusing on whether the federal government should impose the costs of the new requirements on states and localities. The debate also revealed that the proposed rules were not based on a good understanding of the needs of minority language students, the availability of bilingual education teachers and instructional materials, or the status of local efforts to provide language assistance services.

The federal effort to regulate services to language minority students is in abeyance, but the issue is likely to arise again. Any further effort to clarify state and local responsibilities can succeed only if it is based on a good understanding of existing local needs, resources, and services. The purpose of this study is to provide some of the necessary information. It provides, for a small but reasonably representative sample of the school districts that serve minority language students, answers to five questions:

- What services are being delivered to language minority students?
- How do the patterns of service vary by type of district?
- What specific deficiencies in language assistance services are perceived by beneficiary groups and educators?
- What is the apparent cause of these deficiencies?
- Do local beneficiary groups and educators see any need for federal regulation, and if so, what should the rules encompass?

Results are based on an analysis of language assistance services in eight school districts located throughout the United States. The districts were selected to vary in geographic location, size, urban/suburban/rural setting, ethnic composition, and the character of state legislation on educational rights of language minority groups. Data on language assistance programs were obtained by direct classroom observation and through interviews with school administrators, parents, and representatives of language minority assistance groups.

Key findings include:

- Services to language minority students vary enormously from one school district to another. Most districts offer one or two preferred types of services to all language minority students, with little regard for differences in students' individual needs.
- Language assistance services are seldom available in secondary schools, despite the growing numbers of non-English-speaking students of high-school age.
- Few districts have adequate means either for identifying students in need of special language instruction or for assessing when it is appropriate to terminate instruction. Indeed, assessment materials themselves are inadequate for all language groups.
- School districts have serious problems finding qualified teachers and appropriate instructional materials for some language groups. Instructional resources are available for Spanish- and Vietnamese-speaking children but very scarce for new immigrants from Asian countries other than Vietnam.
- Language assistance programs that have met with the greatest approval are those that have involved local communities in developing services that fit their own unique instructional needs.

The report concludes with two broad recommendations for the federal role in minority language education: First, there is a need for federal regulation to ensure that local districts do not neglect the education of language minority children. Local circumstances are too diverse to justify highly detailed federal requirements, but some general guarantees are necessary, such as parent, community, and local educator involvement in determining program goals, content, and strategies for their schools. Second, the federal government should support research and development to improve language assistance programs. Federal research and development funds should:

- Provide seed money for development of secondary-school programs and training of qualified teachers.
- Develop needs-assessment and instructional materials for new immigrant groups.
- Develop and improve language assistance curricula.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

Section
I. INTRODUCTION 1
Background of the Study 1
Study Objectives 2
Organization of the Report 5

II. STUDY DESIGN 6
Overview 6
Site Selection 6
Research Staff 7
Procedures 8
Sample Characteristics 11

III. PROGRAM TYPES: STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS 15
Program Features 15
Classroom Organization 15
Instructional Strategies 20
General Problems 24

IV. FACTORS AFFECTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS 27
State and Local Regulation 27
Community Desires 29
History of the Language Minority Group in the Community ... 30
Concentration of Language Minority Populations 32
Human and Material Resources 34
Fiscal Constraints 36
Pedagogical Considerations 39

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 42
Regulating Language Assistance Programs 42
The Federal Role: Recommendations 44

Appendix: DESCRIPTIONS OF STUDY SITES 47

BIBLIOGRAPHY 61

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Two major events, the 1968 Title VII Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* Supreme Court decision, set the stage for the current language assistance programs in the United States. Title VII provided the funding--and hence the impetus--for bilingual education programs. What it did *not* provide were clear guidelines about how to implement a bilingual program. However, two of its key provisions have had repercussions that continue into the 1980s. Programs were to expand vertically, not horizontally; thus, subsequent grades could be added on at federal expense, but more classrooms at the same grade could not. Moreover, after the third year of expansion, districts were to begin to absorb the costs of the most developed grade-level programs. While the rules were intended to encourage the states and local districts to take an active role in the support and development of bilingual programs, the actual results were not always consistent with this goal. Some programs were either phased out or cut back as federal monies dried up. Bilingual program features were frequently dropped in an effort to cut costs, so that programs were scaled down to a less costly English as a Second Language (ESL) approach.

The second major event, the *Lau v. Nichols* decision, resulted from a suit brought on behalf of Chinese-American children in San Francisco. This ruling had the effect of *requiring* special services for non-English-speaking pupils. Districts that failed to comply were threatened with loss of federal funds. Where Title VII was the carrot, *Lau* became the stick. Although the court mandated that children should be taught in such a manner that they could "effectively participate" and receive a "meaningful" education, it did not specify methodology. It was not until 1975, when a team of experts selected by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) published the *Task Force Findings Specifying Remedies Available for Eliminating Past Educational Practices Ruled Unlawful under Lau v. Nichols*, that a bilingual approach was specified.

Even after 1975, however, the "Lau Remedies," as they came to be known, did not carry the force of law. Although the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) continued to use the Remedies as the standard by which to evaluate the compliance of school districts, there was a growing realization that the Congress needed to adopt a set of rules that would formalize and institutionalize federal policy on language assistance services. This need became even more pressing when an Alaskan court[1] challenged HEW's authority to require adherence to the Remedies. The Alaskan lawsuit and the increasing uneasiness with the absence of legally mandated rules resulted in the publication in August 1980 of a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM). The proposed rules reflected much of the 1975 Remedies, along with some significant changes. The NPRM generated a great deal of controversy, however, and while the OCR was debating possible changes and the Congress was acting to forestall release of the new rules, the new Administration withdrew them in February 1981.

Unfortunately, the events that had led up to the publication of the NPRM had generated more heat than light, and there were accusations on all sides of political-legal maneuvering that did not take into account the real needs of the clients and school districts. What was absent, even as late as the hearings that followed the NPRM, was a factual account of the range of the districts' needs, problems, limitations, and proposed solutions. The 1981 pause in the forward motion of the regulatory effort provided the opportunity to gather this basic information and to build a better understanding of the scope of the need for language assistance services and the role the federal government might reasonably play.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the present study was to provide an overview of existing local language assistance programs, the political and educational climates in which they function, and the language assistance constituencies' perceptions of government regulation.

---

[1] *Northwest Arctic School District et al. v. Califano et al.*, A77216 Civil (U.S. District Court, District of Alaska), 1978.

Information and opinion were collected from all sectors of the educational community, from school board members and superintendents to parents and other community members. Specifically, we sought to describe language assistance programs in a national sample of school districts by addressing the following questions:

- What services are being delivered to language minority students?
- How do the patterns of service vary by type of district?
- What specific deficiencies in language assistance services are perceived by beneficiary groups and educators?
- What is the apparent cause of these deficiencies?
- Do local beneficiary groups and educators see any need for federal regulation, and if so, what should the rules encompass?

We first sought to describe the existing programs and to provide an understanding of how they evolved. Past attempts to describe programs on the basis of what they are called have been misleading and have tended to oversimplify a complex and ill-defined pedagogical area. Labeling has been a persistent problem in understanding the nature of language assistance programs. We cannot ignore the names given to programs, however, so we have tried to make explicit what, in fact, the label represents in each case.

The second task, describing how patterns of service vary among districts, is critical to an understanding of the potential for generalization of rules. In the hearings that followed the publication of the NPRM, many local educational agency (LEA) administrators alluded to the "uniqueness" of their districts. The LEAs consistently criticized the federal government for not taking local differences into account when the rules were drawn up. They further contended that overly specific rules should not be applied without regard for those differences. We attempted to ascertain a sense of the range of differences in needs and capacities to meet those needs in school districts across the country.

The third question we addressed relates directly to the central issue of why regulation is needed at all. Presumably the federal government regulates only when it believes that some form of external pressure is necessary to prevent inequality in the delivery of services by state and local educational agencies. Regulations should therefore be built on a clear understanding of how and why state and local programs differ. We sought information about the perceived limitations of existing programs, from all possible perspectives at each site.

Our fourth area of investigation, the apparent cause of the limitations, was perhaps the most politically sensitive aspect of the study. We found a series of factors that appear to affect the type and adequacy of programs offered. Some of these factors can be, and are being, effectively dealt with through local regulations, such as requirements for training and certification of teaching personnel. Other factors, such as the lack of skilled bilingual individuals to meet the needs of recently immigrated groups, pose greater problems. In addition, attitudes resulting from sudden demographic changes in some communities and long-standing feelings of mistrust in others also create deficiencies in programs. In these cases, regulation imposed at any level is apt to be controversial.

Finally, we gathered opinions about the need for federal regulation at each of the sites visited. The range of opinion is great, even within categories of respondents, e.g., teachers, Hispanics, urbanites. However, the individuals most directly affected by the bureaucracy of regulation, i.e., program administrators, were often the most outspoken about the need for it. Program administrators were generally cognizant of the hazards of deregulation or underregulation of a system designed to respond to majority concerns.

In summary, this study proposed to provide a general view of existing language assistance programs, the political and educational climates in which they function, and the perceptions of their constituencies with respect to government regulation of programs. However, it soon became apparent that we were also describing the politics of implementing a language assistance program. While language assistance programs are essentially pedagogical entities, their

implementation inevitably has many political ramifications and consequences.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Section II reviews the design of the study and the general characteristics of the sites we selected for our sample. Section III presents an overview of the kinds of programs that have been implemented in the LEAs and discusses some of the problems they have faced. Section IV discusses the major factors that appear to affect the implementation and functioning of language assistance programs. Section V summarizes our analysis of the information we gathered and proposes a set of recommendations for the federal response to the needs of language minority children. Finally, detailed descriptions of each of the study sites are given in the Appendix.

II. STUDY DESIGN

OVERVIEW

At the outset we realized that one of this study's unique contributions could, and should, be the gathering of a broad range of opinion on issues related to the implementation of language assistance programs. Much of the literature on second-language education has been polemic, and few previous studies have attempted to provide more than a single perspective. To paint a comprehensive picture of the programs included in our sample, we decided upon a case study approach, in which we could interview a broad range of interested parties, representing as much diversity of perspective as possible. We interviewed school board members, superintendents, district administrators, principals, teachers, and aides, as well as parents and other interested community members. We were careful to avoid such terms as "bilingual education," "bilingual program," or any other reference to a specific teaching methodology. Each district thus defined in its own terms the kind of methodology it was using. If a district was firmly committed to a particular approach, we adjusted our questions to reflect its terminology; however, if no single approach was common throughout a district or if there was any hint of disagreement over approach, we referred only to the "language assistance program."

SITE SELECTION

Clearly much of the value of this study rests on the representativeness of the language assistance programs at the sample sites. Budget and time constraints restricted us to a maximum of eight sites; therefore, we had to give careful consideration to the criteria for inclusion in the study as well as to the site selection method. We established the following criteria for inclusion in our sample: geographical location, variation in state legislation, size of district, urban/suburban/rural context, and representation of at least one of the three major Hispanic groups (Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Mexican-Americans), American Indian, and/or Indochinese/Asian. We also

wanted the district sample to be representative of implementation problems. We were not interested in viewing only programs that were considered exemplary, nor were we interested in seeing only programs that were struggling. We hoped to see some of each, and as many degrees in between as possible. To this end, we asked for nominations of sites that represented a range of implementation and quality levels. We are confident that the pool from which we selected the sites contained wide variation on these variables.

We used the following nomination procedure to develop a sizable pool of potential sample sites. We first drew up a nationwide list of individuals and organizations who were likely to know of districts that met our requirements. These included officials at centers for research and in-service training in bilingual education, national authorities on the subject, and university and state Education Department personnel who have been involved in large-scale program evaluations or surveys. Individuals were contacted by telephone and letter and were asked to nominate districts for inclusion in the study. We emphasized to all contacts that we wanted to describe "the challenges faced by a *variety* of districts implementing language assistance programs." We also mentioned that we were interested in seeing programs that were "in place" and that would be representative of a particular approach or set of circumstances. The eight sites we selected represented the desired demographic and program diversity (see Table 1, below).

RESEARCH STAFF

The selection of appropriate research personnel was a highly sensitive and important aspect of the study. We needed not only skilled interviewers who could put the subjects at ease and extract the relevant information, but also individuals who would not be viewed as a political liability in any of the diverse settings in which they would be conducting interviews. We were acutely conscious of the fact that an individual who is a member of the minority group being served by the language assistance program in the district might well trigger different responses from school officers than someone who might be perceived to be more neutral. On the other hand, we were equally aware of the need to be able to put community representatives at ease and to be able to

communicate with parents in their own language about the services their children were receiving. This problem was resolved to some extent by pairing researchers, one "neutral" (i.e., non-minority) and one who could be perceived to identify with the language minority groups of the district. All six researchers involved in data collection had extensive experience in case study methodology and elite interviewing. Additionally, all had participated in a two-day training session on the use of the instruments developed for this study and on the background and major issues related to language assistance service delivery.

PROCEDURES

Once a district had agreed to participate in the study, a liaison individual was selected (usually by the superintendent of the district) to help coordinate the site visit and set up appointments with interviewees. We sent a letter to each district, outlining the individuals to whom we wished to speak, the order in which we hoped to interview them, and the amount of time required for each interview. The districts were exceedingly helpful, and in most cases interview appointments were set up well in advance of our arrival at the sites. Appointments to interview community representatives and parents, however, were generally made by the research team at the site to allow greater control over gathering information from a wide range of individuals. We were careful not to interview only parents and community members who had been hand-picked by the district. And because we had purposely made community contacts beforehand, we were frequently able to interview individuals who had been located independently of school district recommendations.

An average of three days were spent by the two researchers at each site interviewing people in the following jobs, roles, or categories:

- School board member(s)
- Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
- Director of Bilingual Education
- Director of Compensatory Education

- Director of Title VII (if district has Title VII)
- Director of Personnel
- Head of Bilingual Parent Advisory Council
- President of PTA
- Representatives of language minority interest groups
- Respresentatives of other interest groups with positions on language assistance policy
- Outside consultant(s) providing technical assistance to the district on bilingual education
- Principals of schools serving language minority children
- Bilingual coordinators--school and district
- Teachers and aides providing language assistance instruction
- Regular classroom teachers whose students receive language assistance or instruction from other teachers or aides
- Parents and/or other community representatives
- Teachers' union representatives

To capture the maximum amount of information and to ensure that the same information was gathered at each site, considerable time and effort were invested in developing specific interview protocols. A separate set of questions was drawn up for each of the categories of individuals to be interviewed. As much as possible, questions overlapped among interviewees to collect multiple perspectives on aspects of the program and issues in the district and community.

The following areas of questioning were pursued with the respondents, with greater or lesser emphasis placed on those areas most pertinent to the individual interviewee:

- *Context of the language assistance program in the district*: How it came about; who funded it; how it has changed over time; adequacy of funding; demographic profile of the district.
- *Background information on the students served by the program*: How children are assessed; who makes placement decisions; how children get in and out of programs.

- *The instructional program*: What it consists of; who is eligible for how long; what kind of technical assistance is provided for program implementors.
- *Staffing*: Who provides services; the educational criteria for language assistance instructional personnel; what types of training and incentives are available; turnover rates; union involvement.
- *Curriculum materials*: What materials are used; how they are obtained or developed; whether the district has a standard curriculum for language minority children; adequacy of materials available.
- *Compliance with state and federal guidelines or regulations*: What is currently being required of the district; the record of compliance to date; problems, past and present; what caused those problems.
- *Issues and attitudes in regulation*: Whether regulation is needed; why or why not; the position of school board, administrators, and parents with respect to delivery of services; whether language minority groups have been organized to lobby for services; the relationship between district administration and community; how language assistance services coordinate with other educational mandates such as title programs and desegregation efforts; the position of the teachers' union; what would happen in the district if language assistance services were deregulated?
- *Satisfaction with current program*: Who is happy; who is unhappy; whether the program is meeting its goals; what changes should be made.

Additionally, several classrooms, representing the range of programs provided in the district, by grade level as well as teaching methodology, were observed at each of the study sites. Classrooms were selected on the basis of their representativeness of the types of services being offered and students being served. Any unique programs or classes that were operating in the district were also observed.

Observations were unstructured; their purpose was to provide the researchers with a clearer understanding of the program as well as to validate information gathered from the interviews.

Finally, after all data had been collected, the information was synthesized in two ways. Discussion groups and debriefings were held in which all of the researchers involved in the study compared their observations and drew tentative conclusions about the major themes in the delivery of language assistance services in the sample districts. Second, all interview notes were reviewed, cross-referenced, and organized by topic areas for each district, then for all districts combined. This enabled us to identify a number of issues and programmatic responses that were found in all the districts, and some that were specific to particular districts.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The broad characteristics of each of the districts included in the study are listed in Table 1. The districts have been given fictitious names to protect privacy.

State legislation in Condado and Valle is considered strong because it is comprehensive--providing for training and certification of teachers, entry and exit assessment of students, minimum standards for bilingual instructional time and materials, and program monitoring--and because minimum standards for program offerings are relatively high. In contrast, the state laws applying to Pueblo Historico are considered "flexible" because they leave a great deal to the discretion of the district. As a result, some districts in the state have very comprehensive programs, while others provide minimal services. All districts are required to provide some special help to limited-English speakers through the third grade. Silver Spur's state, on the other hand, specifically restricts instruction in any language other than English. However, in practice this simply means that the state Education Department does not involve itself in programs for language minority children.

Enrollment figures, percentage of students receiving language assistance services, and specific language groups served by the districts are shown in Table 2. Enrollment at the time of our study

Table 1

DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

District*	Region	State Legislation	District Type	Major Language Minority Groups
Condado	West	Yes ("strong")	Urban-suburban	Hispanic (Mexican origin); Indochinese
Valle	West	Yes ("strong")	Rural (migrant)-suburban	Hispanic (Mexican origin)
Silver Spur	Southwest	Restricts non-English instruction	Urban	Hispanic (Mexican origin); Native American
Pueblo Historico	Southwest	Yes ("flexible")	Urban	Hispanic; Native American
Cosmos	Midwest	Yes	Urban	Hispanic (Puerto Rican and Mexican origin); Native American
Rancho Grande	Southwest	Yes	Urban	Hispanic (Mexican origin)
Frontera	Southwest	Yes	Rural (migrant)	Hispanic (Mexican origin)
Paradise	Southeast	No	Urban	Hispanic (Cuban origin); Haitian; Native American

*District names are fictitious.

ranged from less than 10,000 to more than 135,000 students. In the sample districts, Spanish speakers formed the largest group of LES/NES students who received language assistance services. Some districts also served Indochinese (Vietnamese, Chinese, Thai, Hmong), Native American, Asian Pacific (Tagalog, Japanese, Korean), Haitian Creole, and Portuguese language speakers (Table 2). Several districts were included in the sample because they enroll Native American students; however, we

Table 2

ENROLLMENT OF SAMPLE DISTRICTS AND LANGUAGE GROUPS SERVED

District	Enrollment	Language Group	Percentage of Enrollment Served in Bilingual Program
Frontera	7,000	Spanish	52
Pueblo Historico	11,500	Spanish	17
Valle	12,500	Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese	25
Condado	30,000	Spanish, Vietnamese, Hmong, Laotian, Cambodian	33
Silver Spur	56,000	Spanish, various Native American languages	3
Rancho Grande	62,000	Spanish	18
Cosmos	88,000	Spanish, German, French	2.5
Paradise	135,000	Spanish, Haitian Creole, Vietnamese, Lao, Thai, Korean, Chinese, Japanese	1

found only one district that provided a language assistance program for this group.

Table 3 shows the percentage of students in various ethnic categories in the sample districts. Six districts have significant Hispanic populations (primarily Mexican, Mexican-American, and Central American), comprising 30 to 95 percent of total enrollment. The largest concentration of Asians and Pacific Islanders is in Condado, where they

Table 3

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS AT SAMPLE SITES
(percent)

District	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islanders	Other
Condado	20	5	60	15	0
Valle	52.5	0	47	5	0
Silver Spur	62	5	30	2	1
Pueblo Historico	43	0.6	63	0.3	2
Cosmos	45	47	6	1	1
Rancho Grande	11	16	73	1	1
Frontera	5	0	95	0	0
Paradise	81	13	5	1	0

comprise 15 percent of total enrollment. Blacks outnumber Hispanics as the largest ethnic minority group in only two sample districts, Cosmos and Paradise, where they make up 47 and 13 percent of total enrollment.

Detailed descriptions of each of the study sites and their program components are given in the Appendix.

III. PROGRAM TYPES: STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

This section reviews the types of programs in the sample districts, the kinds of students usually served by each of these programs, and some of the limitations associated with each. Finally, we review three general problems that exist in virtually all the programs we saw.

PROGRAM FEATURES

Language assistance programs have two major features: classroom organization (the physical and pedagogical parameters within which instruction takes place) and instructional strategies (the actual techniques or methods used to teach subject matter). Separating these two basic features enables us to better understand the way a program functions and also to identify areas where inaccurate or overly broad labels obscure what actually goes on in the classroom.

Table 4 presents the basic organization of programs for each of the districts. Instructional strategies employed within the programs are discussed below. We make no attempt to categorize instructional strategies by district, however, because of the tremendous diversity in teaching methodologies at each of the sites. Even in districts with a strong language assistance instructional philosophy (e.g., "rapid transition to English," "maintenance of the mother tongue"), teaching methodology differs almost as much from classroom to classroom as it does among districts of widely varying philosophies.

CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION

The sample districts use several strategies to organize instruction provided to LES/NES students, ranging from all-day self-contained classes to part-time pull-out programs and special centers for language minority and/or newly immigrated students. Some districts also offer special centers for fluent English speakers wishing immersion in a non-English program.

Table 4

CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION BY DISTRICT

District	Classroom Organization			
	Self-Contained	Pull-Out/ Elective Second-Language Instruction	Team Teaching	Centers
Frontera				
Elementary	X	X	X	
Secondary		X		
Pueblo Historico				
Elementary	X			
Secondary		X		
Valle				
Elementary	X	X		
Secondary		X		
Condado				
Elementary	X	X		
Secondary	X	X		
Silver Spur				
Elementary	X	X		
Secondary		X		
Rancho Grande				
Elementary	X	X		
Secondary		X		
Cosmos				
Elementary	X	X		X
Secondary		X		X
Paradise				
Elementary	X	X		X
Secondary		X		X

Self-Contained Classrooms

In the self-contained classroom, students usually receive all of their instruction in a single setting, with one teacher and often an aide. In classrooms using an immersion technique, teachers are fluent in both the immersion language and English. (If English is the language of immersion, they may be monolingual.) In many programs serving Spanish-speaking students, either or both the teacher and aide speak at least some Spanish and some amount of "bilingual" instruction occurs, even if it consists only of an occasional explanation in Spanish. However, very few teachers can provide assistance to Cambodian, Laotian, Thai, or Haitian students in their own language.

Children in self-contained classrooms are usually limited in English-language skills, although this is not always the case. Most districts and schools make an attempt to integrate their self-contained classrooms with English-speaking students in accordance with federal and state guidelines; however, this is not always practical. The demand for services by LES/NES children is often so great that there is no room left for students who are not truly in need. Also, in some districts the language assistance classes are viewed as remedial classes and English-speaking parents are not anxious to enroll their children in them.

All of the districts we visited provide at least some of their language minority students with instruction in a self-contained classroom. These are nearly always called "bilingual classes," although they occasionally go by other names and may also include immersion programs. The amount and nature of bilingual instruction in these classes varies greatly from district to district, and even from classroom to classroom within a district. In some bilingual classrooms instruction occurs mostly in English, with occasional explanations in Spanish; in others the language mix is just the opposite. In a third type of classroom some subjects are taught in one language, while other subjects are taught in a second language. The variations are numerous and many different kinds of bilingual classrooms were observed in the districts. Interestingly, the source of variation is just as apt to be differences in teachers as differences in district policies or state

rules or guidelines. Hence, the full range of classroom types is likely to exist within any district, regardless of state or local policy.

The amount of time a child is allowed to stay in a bilingual classroom is usually fixed by criteria established by the district or the state. In most states that regulate language assistance, schools are required to provide such classes only through a specified number of grades (K-3, for example, in New Mexico and Texas), and children are tested at periodic intervals to assess whether they are ready to exit the program and be "mainstreamed." In most of the districts we visited, the children are expected to exit after three years in the program; hence there are fewer and fewer classrooms at each higher grade level. We saw only one example of a self-contained classroom at the secondary level, the self-contained "literacy" class offered in Condado, which is essentially a self-contained ESL program.

There is recent evidence that a self-contained (bilingual) classroom may deliver more language assistance for the dollar than other types of language assistance programs (Carpenter-Huffman and Samulon, 1981). However, the term "bilingual" is used so broadly that it is not possible to say what kind of instruction a child is receiving in a bilingual classroom without looking at the specific classroom.

Pull-Out Programs

Pull-out programs are common throughout grades 1-12; they exist, in one form or another, in all the districts we visited. Children in these programs are taken out of their regular classroom for anywhere from a few minutes a week to several hours a day for special language assistance. Instructional methods within the pull-out setting also vary considerably. Students may be tutored individually or in groups; instruction may be bilingual or in English only; content may include explanations of the work being covered in the regular classroom, or it may consist of a separate ESL lesson or a combination of classroom work and ESL. The teacher may be a highly qualified bilingual teacher, a certified monolingual ESL teacher, or just a floating teacher with no particular qualifications to instruct LES/NES children.

Several schools in one of the districts have special rooms filled with technologically advanced, computerized learning centers. Language minority students are sent to these resource rooms for one hour a day or every other day to work on individualized language assistance programs. The program appears to be extremely innovative. However, in reality, the children lack adequate supervision; many sit in front of the terminals reading comic books, while others pay little attention to what they are doing. The teacher in one of the resource rooms admitted that a great deal of the equipment is useless because the teachers have never been instructed in its appropriate use.

Pull-out programs are especially popular in three settings: (1) where there is a conscious effort to "mainstream" children who are not yet proficient enough in English to understand all that is going on in the regular classroom; (2) where LES/NES children are not concentrated in large enough numbers to warrant a separate classroom; and (3) at the secondary level where students naturally change classrooms several times during the day.

While schools have good reasons for depending on pull-out programs to provide services, this approach also presents many problems. The biggest problem for the students involved is "interference." When students are pulled out of their assigned classroom for special help, they may actually miss out on subject matter they need to be learning (Kimbrough and Hill, 1981). Teachers complain that it is difficult to teach these students and that it is virtually impossible for them to keep up with the rest of the class.

Team Teaching

One of our sample districts uses an interesting variation on the pull-out program. Two teachers share the students, who are grouped according to their language needs. Each teacher instructs in a different language, but both follow the same curriculum and schedule. The students travel back and forth between the two classrooms. This approach avoids some of the problems of "interference" encountered in standard pull-out programs, although teachers still complain that students are not "getting" everything that goes on in the classroom.

The teachers also point out that some students see the primarily Spanish classroom as a haven and revert completely to Spanish when they enter it.

Language Assistance Centers

The "center" approach is often used to provide intensive English language and culture instruction to students who are newly immigrated to the United States and who do not comprise a large enough or concentrated enough group within the schools to make other kinds of programming feasible. Like other language assistance program structures, centers vary greatly in method approach and even in goals. The Paradise district, which has low student-teacher ratios and high per-pupil expenditures, has language assistance centers located at separate campus sites. The district has set as its goal the production of language minority students whose academic performance level is equal to that of their native-English-speaking peers.

Centers are also used for immersion programs, such as the French, German, and Spanish immersion classes offered in the Cosmos district. Here, the programs are housed at regular school sites, and the goal is to produce fluently bilingual youngsters who can compete favorably with monolingual students in regular school programs. Children may remain at the Cosmos or Paradise centers for several years, depending on need, availability, and student progress.[1] Some other districts have "newcomer" centers, which LES/NES children attend for only a few months while they receive an introduction to American education and language.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Instructional methods available to LES/NES students include various bilingual approaches, ESL, formal instruction about a second language (e.g., Spanish for fluent English speakers, or Spanish language instruction for those whose primary language is Spanish), and immersion in a second language.

---

[1]See the Appendix for a more complete description.

Bilingual Education

The term "bilingual education" is overused, ill-defined, and applied to an array of programs that bear varying degrees of resemblance to each other. Bilingual education means, literally, the provision of instruction in two languages: the student's native language and the language he is trying to learn. However, the goal of a bilingual program may be transitional (i.e., to move children into English as rapidly as possible) or it may be developmental (i.e., to teach first-language skills concurrently with English in an effort to build on both languages). There are also a few "bilingual" programs that focus almost exclusively on first-language skills at early grades. Depending on the goals of the program--and the great majority assert that their goal is transitional--a variety of methods may be employed. Some bilingual programs provide only an occasional explanation in the native language; others provide only an occasional explanation in English. Some focus on native language instruction of core subjects, and English instruction of all other classes in the early years. Some programs call for alternate explanations in two languages or separate classes so that the teacher and aide instruct in two languages simultaneously. Another program provides native language instruction one day and English the next. Still another program consists of English language instruction for the majority of the day, with Spanish as a Second Language (SSL) for one or two periods.

At the secondary level, some schools offer core subjects bilingually, on a classroom-by-classroom basis. For example, a student may take algebra and science bilingually and all other courses in regular English-only classes. The language mix that occurs in these classrooms and the techniques utilized vary according to the teacher, as in other bilingual classrooms.

Some bilingual teachers contend that it is impossible to cover bilingually the same curriculum the majority students receive in English only--there is simply not enough time. Other teachers state that with careful preparation they do provide the same curriculum to their language minority students as that taught to majority students.

Based on our observations, it is likely that both sets of teachers are correct and that many different methods of "bilingual" instruction may work equally well or equally poorly, given individual circumstances. The factors that seem to have powerful effects on the implementation and functioning of bilingual programs are discussed in Sec. IV.

English as a Second Language

"English as a Second Language" merely means instruction *in* English *about* English for non-native English speakers. When ESL instruction is part of a pull-out program, the teachers are usually monolingual, at least in the districts we observed. However, ESL is also a standard component of almost all bilingual classes--a certain part of the day is devoted to the development of English language skills, in English. A great controversy has grown up between the teachers of ESL and the bilingual teachers who use ESL methods in their classrooms. Some trained ESL teachers contend that their skills are underutilized in favor of less effective bilingual programs, while some bilingual teachers see the ESL program as superfluous, since it is incorporated into a bilingual curriculum. Most of the elementary schools with large language minority populations in most of the districts we visited offer both ESL and bilingual programs and allow students to choose, depending on availability. At the secondary level, most schools provide only ESL.

Instruction About a Second Language

Formal instruction *about* a second language--outside the context of bilingual education or ESL--is most commonly found at the secondary level, where courses are offered in Spanish or French, for example. At the elementary level, the classes are commonly referred to as SSL, FSL, etc., and may or may not be an adjunct to an ESL or bilingual program. At Pueblo Historico, the bilingual program consists almost entirely of instruction about Spanish (SSL), since the community is trying to reinforce bilingualism in an area that is rapidly becoming monolingual.

Although instruction about a "foreign" language is available in most--and even required in some--high schools, such instruction, particularly if the "foreign" language is one the child already speaks,

is highly controversial at the elementary school level. While some parents, such as those in Pueblo Historico, are anxious for their children to retain and expand on Spanish language skills, many districts express a concern that proficiency in a language other than English is beyond the scope and resources of the public schools. Hence, the commitment of districts such as Pueblo Historico and Cosmos to the development of non-English language skills is an example of the allocation of resources to a somewhat different set of priorities than is found in many other school districts.

Immersion

Loosely defined, immersion programs provide students with an intensive, all-encompassing experience in a language that is foreign to them. However, we have discovered great diversity in immersion programs. An immersion program may "immerse" the children in English, in another language that is new to them, or even in their home language until they are considered ready to transfer to a bilingual or other language assistance program. (This third interpretation of immersion, while uncommon, was in use in one large western district which we considered, but finally rejected, as a study site.) The immersion may be total or part-day. The curriculum may allow children to ask questions in their own language or it may forbid this. The teacher may or may not be bilingual and may or may not provide some explanation in the child's own language. English immersion programs range from a curriculum that differs in no apparent way from any other English curriculum to one that is carefully organized to provide a "heavy dosage" of verbal English along with instructional support. In Cosmos, immersion programs are offered as enrichment opportunities for students who wish to become proficient in a non-English language; in Frontera, some parents have proposed immersion as a means of providing their children with maximum exposure to English; in Condado, some critics of the bilingual program see immersion as a means of mainstreaming language minority students into regular all-English classes and thereby dismantling the bilingual program.

GENERAL PROBLEMS

While there are specific problems associated with some methods of program organization (e.g., the interference that occurs with pull-out programs) and some strategies of instruction (e.g., the conflict that exists between some teachers of ESL and bilingual teachers who provide ESL services), there are three general deficiencies that affect all the language assistance programs we observed: (1) student-program match, (2) program transition (entry/exit) criteria, and (3) secondary-school services.

Student-Program Match

Needless to say, there are many strongly held opinions about the best way to educate language minority children. Unfortunately, such convictions, translated into dogmatic defense of a particular approach, have resulted in bad feelings and a sense of exclusion for some people in almost all the sample districts. Even in districts where an attempt is made to provide a choice of programming, as is the case in most of the districts we visited, local school administrators and teachers may circumvent this choice because of a strong belief in a particular methodology. Or a district may offer several options, but space and logistical problems prevent parents and children from availing themselves of these options. In some districts there is open hostility between some school officers and some members of the community because of lack of choice. The end result in all of these cases is that many people--teachers, administrators, and parents--complain that they are forced to go along with a program that is not of their choosing.

The more realistic options the parent and child have, the greater the likelihood that a good student-program match will occur. Some parents do not want their children taught any language other than English. Some students are lost in an all-English setting. Schools and districts that provide reasonable and accessible options are more likely to have satisfied constituents. Yet some schools and districts will not provide such options unless they are required to do so. The refusal to provide options may be based on cost arguments or on philosophical positions, yet some districts do manage to utilize resources effectively to provide multiple options and satisfy diverse constituent positions.

Program Transition

Without a doubt, there is no issue more thorny in the language assistance community than that of entry and exit criteria. Some states have developed guidelines or rules that set down specific test and performance criteria for entry to and exit from language assistance programs. However, even in these states there is continuing discussion about how to make more accurate assessments. There is no consensus about when a language minority child is ready to learn in an English classroom without any extra help. This lack of agreement is due in part to philosophical differences, but it is also the result of sparse and inadequate language assessment materials. The question clearly needs further research, and in the meantime school personnel need help in grappling with the issue as it affects them. In the absence of definitive criteria, language minority children need the protection of guidelines that are both humane and flexible. Not all the guidelines or rules developed by local school boards or state agencies fit those categories. Some district administrators complain that their state will not pay for a child enrolled in a language assistance program after a specified period of time--regardless of the child's English ability. Others complain that the seemingly reasonable formulas set up by the state for exiting students are inflexible and do not allow for individual differences.

Secondary-School Services

In virtually every district we visited, administrators, parents, and teachers decried the fact that language assistance services at the secondary level are woefully inadequate. Some districts all but ignore secondary students, focusing their efforts almost totally on the early grades. This may stem, in part, from "benign neglect"--that is, district people simply forget that not all non-English speakers grow up in the community in which they attend high school. It may also be, in some cases, a reaction against "foreigners" coming into the district. However, the problem is not all attitudinal. Classroom organization (rotation of students) at the secondary level, insufficient numbers of qualified personnel, and inadequate materials are also prime reasons for the very limited help offered secondary students.

Some districts we visited have made earnest attempts to provide understandable instruction to LES/NES secondary-school children. Paradise has a well-developed secondary program and Cosmos provides a bilingual strand of courses for these students. In Pueblo Historico, some classes are offered bilingually. However, most secondary students are left to sink or swim, with at most a few minutes a day in a pull-out program with an ESL teacher. Even the districts with the most comprehensive programs lack appropriate instructional materials. All districts express a need for help in this area.

IV. FACTORS AFFECTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

While scholarly debate, along with the national media, has focused on the relative effectiveness of one type of program versus another, the important local decisions about language assistance programs have generally been made on other grounds. Local school officials are usually forced to pay more attention to the politics and the needs of their communities than to careful analysis of evaluation literature.

In the case of language assistance programs, the factors affecting the kind and level of services provided are likely to include state and local regulation, community desires, local history of the language minority group(s), concentration of the language minority population, human and material resources, fiscal constraints, and, finally, pedagogical considerations. These factors and the interplay among them determine the nature, scope, and quality of local language assistance programs; thus they should receive major consideration in the formulation of policy for educating language minority children. This section describes the dynamics of these factors and discusses their implications for federal regulation.

STATE AND LOCAL REGULATION

Approximately half of the states have enacted legislation that addresses the issue of language assistance programs in the public schools.[1] State statutes differ considerably with respect to specificity of program prescription, teacher credentials, eligibility, monitoring, and the like. As an example, in California and Texas, state laws mandate a bilingual approach and are highly specific about program implementation. In contrast, Arizona's law actually restricts the use of non-English languages in the classroom and does not provide for a mechanism to grant teacher credentials for language assistance programs. As might be expected, the states that have addressed the issue legislatively tend to be those with relatively larger language minority populations.

---

[1] *Education Daily*, Vol. 13, No. 199, October 10, 1980, p. 2.

The effect of state or local regulation on actual program implementation is not always predictable. Interestingly, the most comprehensive programs and those that seem to generate the least overt controversy are not necessarily found in states with strong regulation. The presence or absence of state regulation may be used as a political lever in influencing district policy, but many other factors contribute to the final shape and scope of a program. Regardless of how strong or specific state regulations are, local programs do not necessarily reflect a state model, nor do programs within the same state or even the same district always even resemble each other. Perhaps the most important functions of state regulation are those of setting minimal standards, helping to clarify program goals, and providing a resource base for the development of language assistance programs.

But even in states with "strong" language assistance legislation, a great deal of autonomy is exercised at the local district level. This autonomy is undoubtedly the result of several factors--the enormous task of monitoring programs on a statewide basis, state governments' respect for local educators' judgment, and a reluctance at the state level to pay the political costs of open conflict with local districts.

State and local laws reflect the broader political forces of the community and provide markers of public acceptance. The absence of any regulation at the state and local level also reveals information about the level of politicization of these educational issues. While state and local regulations do not always appear to affect programs at the district level in the manner and extent envisioned by legislators, federal regulation can and does have an important impact on state and local policy. In an area as controversial as language assistance services, the federal government is perceived to set the standard--either by example or by direct influence--for a definition of adequate services.

COMMUNITY DESIRES

In each of the districts we observed, there are at least two "communities"--the language majority community, i.e., English speakers, and at least one language minority community. However, even in districts that have several different language groups, it is uncommon to find more than one highly visible language minority group competing for services. In Cosmos, multiple language programs are offered, yet only one language minority group is politically active within the district. Although the state in which Pueblo Historico is located serves large numbers of Native Americans as well as Spanish speakers in the schools, bilingual program directors are quite blunt about the fact that one group or the other is served by a district, but almost never both. Inadequate resources are undoubtedly a factor in this lack of balance; however, it is also clearly related to other political realities. The voice of the most powerful group may be the only one heard--or the only one the school board is willing to listen to. When adequate services are provided for the most vocal group, the district is not likely to be cited for failure to comply with state or federal regulations. Other groups tend to be forgotten, and their attitudes and desires are often not even known to the district.

Even within the acknowledged language communities in a district, there is seldom a comprehensive understanding of language attitudes. Just as there is no single English language community, there is no single Spanish-speaking community or even Mexican-American community, for example. Language attitudes and desires may differ widely within each group as well as between groups. There is no single unified voice giving expression to a "majority" opinion on the issues of language assistance programs. We heard from Anglo parent groups who favor a strong Spanish language maintenance program, and we heard from Spanish-speaking parents who are adamantly in favor of transitional programs that present English-only instruction as soon as possible. We heard from American Indian groups who want bilingual education programs in the schools and from others who consider the use of their native language in the classroom to be sacrilegious. We also heard from Southeast Asian representatives who felt that any language policy for

them is probably premature and from other Asian groups in which class conflicts result in widely differing attitudes between Asian teachers and community members. The task of surveying these attitudes is a complex one and hence is not usually adequately addressed.

The relative access of a group to decisionmaking power is not always, or even usually, related to the group's size. There are many large school districts in which not a single member of the board of education is a member of the "minority" group that forms the majority of the school districts. The language minority groups that appear to be taken most seriously by school districts are generally not organized as "grass roots" efforts; most have had help from outside. In Cosmos the local university has been a significant factor; in Valle and Rancho Grande, Chicano movement organizers have been the impetus.

In sum, while most of the districts we visited are forced either by law or by political circumstances to respond to language minority group desires, attention is generally focused on only one language minority group, and only on the most highly organized factions of that group. The extent to which this group's desires are actually taken into account also appears to depend much more on its degree of organization than on its size in terms of absolute numbers.

In all, the most important finding is that community desires differ greatly even among the most well-organized community groups. And the language attitudes and desires of the great majority of community members are virtually unknown. These facts argue forcefully for options in language assistance services and for a regulating body to ensure that all reasonable positions are taken into account in the development of programs for language minority students.

HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUP IN THE COMMUNITY

A critically important factor that is often overlooked in discussions and planning of language assistance programs is the history of the language minority community in the school district that serves it. The expectations of the language minority community, as well as the majority culture's willingness to attempt to meet those expectations, are at least partially dependent on the length of time the language minority group has resided in the area. Recent arrivals, lacking an

established history in the community, are not likely to be perceived as "deserving" programs that place any emphasis on cultural or linguistic maintenance or enhancement. Immigrant groups that arrive in large numbers over a short period of time, such as the recent Indochinese immigrants, or that consist of migrants who come and go, such as seasonal agricultural workers, may be perceived by the larger community as "intruders" who are already placing inordinate demands on limited resources. This is certainly a problem in Condado and the areas surrounding it.

At the other extreme is Pueblo Historico, where the Hispanic community has asserted an historical right to the maintenance of its language and culture, and apparently the Anglo-American community agrees. (The Native American population has not pressed as hard for its historical rights in the Pueblo Historico schools, and its position on language assistance services is not well known.) The reasons why a language minority group is perceived to be more deserving of special consideration in one place than in another, despite equally lengthy periods of residence, are complex but appear to be related to two specific factors: economics and history. To the extent that a group has acquired economic power or generates economic well-being for the community by virtue of its cultural differences, it is likely to be seen as an important component of the community. Some Hispanic and American Indian groups in the Southwest and some Asians in the West are viewed in this way. Additionally, if a group has a history of cultural *predominance* in a region, the broader society is more apt to be tolerant of its linguistic and cultural differences. Where no economic benefit is derived and no history of cultural predominance has been established, the language minority group is unlikely to be treated with deference. In the case of non-English speakers who have been in a community for a long time but are not perceived to be especially valuable to the region, length of residency can be a liability. Some people voice the opinion that the schools are "coddling" students from these groups who should have learned English before they came to school.

School districts, however, must sooner or later reach an accommodation with the language minority populations they are mandated to serve. And of course, most language minority communities fall

between the extremes of being resented and being cherished. Most of the districts we visited have been in the process of developing a program to serve language minority children over a period of time. Language groups have shifted in some districts and have grown in most, but the problems created by these changes are not viewed as insurmountable. Cosmos has addressed the issues of language shifts in an interesting way. The German-speaking community has historically been an important force in the district, although the actual number of German speakers has dwindled to the point where there is little or no need to assist German-speaking students in the acquisition of English. However, in deference to the group's importance to the culture of the area, a highly successful German immersion program was introduced several years ago. Politically, this tactic has helped to defuse the issue of language assistance services to newer immigrants (mostly Spanish speakers) to the area, since the language assistance program is seen as having multiple goals and also serves as a form of curricular enrichment. Of course, government cannot regulate attitudes toward language minority children, and it can do little to change historical facts. However, regulation can take into account differences in attitudes and ensure that groups are treated fairly despite their differing histories.

CONCENTRATION OF LANGUAGE MINORITY POPULATIONS

The size and concentration of the language minority populations in a school district can greatly affect the type of program offered. While a large population of students is less likely to be ignored and more likely to receive some kind of program, it is also more highly visible and hence more subject to public scrutiny and controversy. On the other hand, districts with small language minority populations sometimes offer exceptionally comprehensive programs. Because of their lower visibility and costs, these districts may be able to experiment with innovative programs that would be prohibitively costly with larger numbers of students.

In Condado, although the cost of the language assistance program is not yet a major issue, the sense of being overwhelmed by the large numbers of students and the diversity of their needs has created a somewhat negative attitude toward language assistance services on the

part of the Board of Education and some school administrators. While we were observing in the district, the Board of Education voted to cut back on its very popular second-language acquisition classes for teachers. The Board made it clear that its vote was precipitated not by financial concerns, but by the philosophy that students should learn English; teachers should not have to learn other languages. The Board contended that teachers who spoke a second language made it "too easy" on the non-English-speaking students.

Programs in other districts with large language minority populations, such as Rancho Grande and Frontera, are also a source of considerable controversy and public comment in the community. School board members and district administrators are challenged with balancing the needs and interests of various opposing forces in the community. This results in a concern on the part of many about an overly politicized program and a possible negative effect on program quality.

Cosmos and Paradise provide an interesting contrast. Both districts have relatively small language minority populations and consequently are able to offer comprehensive and innovative programs at relatively low costs--both financially and politically. Neither program has become a great source of controversy, since neither is highly visible in the context of the overall district budget and program offerings.

The language assistance program in Silver Spur stands alone among those we observed as being very minimally affected by the size of the language minority population. This is probably due in good part to the fact that nobody seems to know how many students are in need of services (a district count has never been taken), but a small population is being served. Since the district encompasses a large Mexican-American population within its boundaries, it is likely that more LES/NES students exist there than are actually being served by the programs. Also, Silver Spur principals enjoy a high degree of autonomy and there is little direction from district administrators and virtually no state regulation. This has resulted in a variety of responses to the needs of language minority students. Individual schools tend to work out their own accommodations to student and community needs, a method of providing services that appears to be more successful in some schools than in others.

In sum, most district programs we observed are greatly affected by the size of language minority populations. But large populations do not necessarily receive more comprehensive services, nor do small populations necessarily suffer from the lesser political clout their size might imply.

HUMAN AND MATERIAL RESOURCES

Clearly one of the most important reasons for choosing to support one kind of language assistance program over another is the availability of human and material resources. Although lack of qualified teachers is a common complaint in most districts that we visited, very real differences exist between language groups and geographical locations with respect to the availability of personnel. To some extent, the problem is one of distribution, particularly for Spanish speakers. The Pueblo Historico administration contends that it turns away numerous qualified applicants, while districts in neighboring states cannot find enough teachers. At Frontera, virtually all of the teachers are bilingual, but many are not adequately trained in bilingual and other teaching methodologies to make effective use of their skills.

On the other hand, districts with smaller and/or more recently immigrated language groups, such as the Indochinese, are experiencing personnel shortages that severely limit the kinds of programs that can be provided to students. Condado, for example, is fortunate to have a director for Southeast Asian language assistance programs who speaks several Southeast Asian languages and has extensive knowledge and contact with that community. Yet he concedes that the only way he can have any program at all is by hiring individuals with widely varying educational backgrounds who speak some English in addition to their native language. These aides help teachers communicate with students, but actual academic aid is often beyond their ability. However, as with the Spanish speakers, not all Southeast Asian groups face the same problems.

Vietnamese immigrants, many of whom came to this country for political rather than economic reasons, have been mainstreamed into school districts such as Condado relatively successfully. Not unlike

the first wave of Cuban immigrants who came to the United States two decades before them, many had considerable educational resources (e.g., previous schooling, well educated parents) when they arrived. And, like the Cubans, they were able to rely on educated people within their own community who worked as classroom aides to help bridge the cultural and linguistic gap they encountered at school. Several people were anxious to point out that Condado has already produced a Vietnamese high-school valedictorian.

Unfortunately, class as well as cultural differences separate the Indochinese subgroups to an even greater extent than occurs within the Latino subgroups. Middle-class Vietnamese have not always been sympathetic to the plight of impoverished Laotian or Cambodian immigrants and have not sought positions working with these children. And, when Vietnamese teachers or aides do work in classrooms populated by various Indochinese groups, it is not clear that they are any more effective in delivering instruction than the monolingual American ESL teachers. The human resource problem among the new immigrants is a very real and pressing problem.

The Southeast Asian programs director in Condado approaches the problem as both a staff and community development issue. He has hired illiterate people with some knowledge of English who appear to have potential and has then worked with them on mastering basic academic skills. He believes they can learn in the classroom along with the children, and that they will one day be able to provide academic instruction. In the meantime, they earn a salary which allows their own children to stay in school and acquire academic skills. Admittedly, this is a long-term solution with few immediate payoffs, yet it does address the broader problems of low educational level of the community.

The American Indian groups represented in the districts we visited are also affected by problems of distribution. Either the students are widely dispersed throughout the district or the numbers of different language groups are so large that a single bilingual classroom for Indian children simply is not feasible. Added to this is a reluctance on the part of some tribes to intermingle secular education with the tribal language which has religious associations.

Problems such as the lack of bilingual and multilingual personnel and inadequately trained bilingual teachers pose obvious impediments to the development of truly bilingual programs. In districts where such problems exist, language assistance programs generally take one of two forms. Either the program consists of ESL only or it tends to be erratic, with instructional support in the native language occurring according to the individual initiative and ability of the teachers.

Generally speaking, the availability of appropriate materials closely parallels the availability of qualified staff, with the major exception of assessment materials. No district that we visited feels it has adequate testing materials to assess the children's language ability in *any* non-English language. Even in the most comprehensive and well-supported programs, assessment is considered the weak link. With respect to classroom materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional aids), the most severe complaints come from teachers of Indochinese children; however, even among the programs serving Spanish speakers, there is consistent dissatisfaction with the paucity of materials appropriate for secondary students. Since few states mandate anything more than ESL for secondary students, it is clear that market incentives do not exist for producing non-English language materials at the secondary level. The few materials that do exist are usually locally developed and specific to the predominant cultural group of the area. Where market incentives are inadequate, other types of incentives should be considered to stimulate the production of usable materials. Government subsidies to partially offset costs to publishers and research grant monies targeted for materials development are two possibilities.

FISCAL CONSTRAINTS

School district budgets, like those of other businesses and agencies, have been affected by the economic limitations of the early 1980s, and schools are forced to set priorities for the allocation of funds. Some of the districts we visited are experiencing immediate effects of a tight economy; others are preparing for what they see as difficult times ahead. All are acutely aware of the costs of their special programs and have attempted to assess the benefits of those

programs. However, we saw considerable variation both in the priorities that have been established and in the manner of funding of special programs. It is fair to say that when a program is considered to be important by the district administration, money is found to support it. On the other hand, where a program is given a low priority, even previously earmarked funds might be diverted from it. Nonetheless, fiscal constraints are commonly cited as reasons for implementing one type of program or another and, as such, deserve discussion.

Pueblo Historico is an example of a district that has placed a high priority on its language assistance program and has "found" the funds to support it. Although state law provides funding only for a limited elementary-school program, the district is using general funds and some Title VII money to strengthen its elementary program and extend it to the secondary level.

Rancho Grande, on the other hand, faced with similar limited funding from the state, has taken a different approach. Although the district--a community in which the majority of the students are of Hispanic background--publicly supports its language assistance program, only state bilingual monies and Title VII funds are used to support it. Program administrators note that "not one cent" of general funds has ever been used to support the program. These administrators contend that the school board and district administration make their support--or lack of it--clear by their allocation of dollars.

Pueblo Historico and Rancho Grande are examples of districts with fairly extensive programs serving large populations. In districts with smaller LES/NES populations, the politics of program funding can be quite different. The Cosmos school district, for example, serves only about 5 percent of its students in the language assistance program, yet it has been an innovator in language assistance methodology. Its program includes bilingual education, immersion in several languages, and ESL. General funds are mixed with state and federal resources to support the program, and until recently there has been little comment or concern over the cost of the program. However, the educated guess of the school board president is that with the coming fiscal crunch, if a choice has to be made between preserving the language assistance programs and preserving football, language assistance "won't stand a chance."

Paradise, another district with a relatively small LES/NES population (approximately 5 percent), is experimenting with an innovative approach to the instruction of language minority pupils. Their low student-teacher-ratio, individualized-education approach is paid for largely out of district funds, since the state has no special funding statute for language assistance. The program has maintained a strong rapid-transition-to-English emphasis and a low profile and, as such, has eluded any attempts at program cuts, which have occurred in other parts of the state. It is important to emphasize, however, that the size of the program is probably as important as any other factor in explaining its survivability.

One more point must be made about the funding of language assistance programs. No matter how small or large the program or how great the need, in all districts that we visited, Title VII funding was cited as the single strongest impetus to the development of a formal bilingual or language assistance program. Even though commitment to some kind of service delivery to language minority students is very strong in some of the districts, no state or local funds had been expressly earmarked for program development in any of them prior to Title VII. In Rancho Grande, a political and intellectual foundation had been laid, and a small experiment in bilingual education had been initiated, but commitment of funds had to wait for Title VII appropriations. Some program administrators pointed to this fact as evidence of the importance of the federal role in language assistance--a role they believe the government should continue to play. Since Title VII now meets a much smaller proportion of the need for services in most school districts, fiscal responsibilities have been thrust onto state and local educational budgets. As this occurs, language assistance programs are assigned a priority ranking on a long list of educational needs. Clearly, those programs that are mandated by government regulation receive a higher funding priority than those that are not mandated. Hence, regulation, at some level, becomes a critical factor in whether funds "are found" to support language assistance programs. Of course, simply substituting a mandate for Title VII funding does not guarantee that the level of support or the quality of programs will not be affected.

PEDAGOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although the question is usually worded simplistically as, What is the most effective type of language assistance program?, the issue is really very complex. School districts that are striving to meet the needs of several LES/NES groups are most apt to ask which kind of program is best for which kind of children. And even those districts that serve only one LES/NES group must consider what kind of program best meets the needs of children at different age, grade, and ability levels. The sparse research in this area offers little guidance, and most districts appear to base their pedagogical decisions on non-pedagogical factors, such as availability of qualified personnel and materials.

Nonetheless, individual teachers as well as district administrators are grappling with some fundamental pedagogical problems. The question of how best to teach children who have basic literacy skills in an Asian language has arisen in Condado. Spanish-speaking children in that district with similar skills generally have the opportunity (at the elementary level) to receive their initial reading instruction in Spanish; they then make the transition into English reading. However, it is not known whether this approach would be useful for Asian students, given that the written symbols, directionality, and basic sentence structure of English and the Asian languages are so different. The district is developing some experimental materials in the children's native language, but without qualified personnel to carry out the instruction, their effectiveness remains unknown. ESL is the only currently feasible instructional strategy in these circumstances.

Likewise, districts that are experiencing a large influx of secondary-school-age students with varying academic skill levels are in a quandary as to the best approach to take. Some students in the Valle district are literate in Spanish, others have had no schooling. Many of these children are migrants who will be traveling back to Mexico, so there is some uneasiness with an English-only approach. Not only do the children lack motivation to acquire academic skills in English only, but some teachers express concern that their education will be so discontinuous that they will derive little actual benefit. Some

teachers believe that it is better to help the children become academically skilled in one language (Spanish) than to waste time on basic English instruction which will soon be forgotten and will add little to their repertoire of skills. On the other hand, some teachers contend that since time is an important factor in educating these children, full attention should be placed on rapid acquisition of English language skills, and a bilingual approach that includes instruction in Spanish is a luxury they cannot afford. Both positions are held quite passionately, and since teachers with whom we spoke in this district have considerable autonomy, pedagogical decisions about the teaching approach to adopt are often made on a classroom-by-classroom basis. Hence, the type of language assistance program children receive in Valle (and several other districts) depends largely on the biases teachers acquire from their training and their personal experiences in teaching.

The Paradise school district has taken an interesting and innovative approach to the problem of individual differences. The district maintains a very low student-teacher ratio in the language assistance center, and the pedagogical approach focuses on individualized instruction. There is no blanket policy, per se, for dealing with different types of students; teachers make individual decisions about the proper strategy to use with each child. Of course, the decisions are largely intuitive and are based on teacher judgment, since Paradise shares the common problem of inadequate assessment materials. However, the low student-teacher ratio does, at least, provide for a continuous feedback mechanism which allows teachers to modify their strategies according to what seems to work.

The districts' approach to pedagogical issues can be summarized by stating that little research has been done that gives clear guidance on the thorny issues of program efficacy for different types of LES/NES students. Because of this, most of the important decisions associated with individual differences are made by teachers on a classroom-by-classroom basis. State regulations and district policies appear to be mediated, in all cases, by teachers' judgments, which is a compelling argument for ensuring that teachers receive the best possible training in pedagogical decisionmaking.

In sum, numerous factors affect the implementation of language assistance programs, but the relative weight given to one or another is highly dependent on the individual circumstances of the school district. *No single factor either accounts for the kind of program a district adopts or is likely to be sufficient to produce a satisfied language assistance program constituency.* All of the factors need to be considered in developing and delivering a viable program.

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

REGULATING LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The basic challenge facing the federal government is to ensure that language minority students are adequately served without interfering with the local districts' right and responsibility to decide what is best for their unique situations. This is not an easy task, and the federal government must tread a fine line between overregulation and abdication of responsibility. While few of the people we interviewed liked regulations, a surprisingly large number of them--including many school district officials--feel that "some kind of language assistance regulation" is necessary. We were surprised at the frequency with which we heard such comments from the districts' federal projects officers--the very people in charge of administering the time-consuming paperwork associated with the regulations.

One major complaint about regulation as it is has been practiced is that local districts often have two masters (state and federal government agencies) who are not always working in concert. This results in considerable duplication of effort for the local districts in attempting to meet the requirements of the two agencies. It also occasionally results in conflicting demands. These kinds of problems clearly argue for the consolidation of regulatory efforts at one level. However, the act of transferring regulatory responsibility from one level of government to another carries strong messages that can, in themselves, affect local policy.[1]

Financial incentives are clearly a powerful factor in regulation. As federal funding of bilingual education has shrunk--from 100 percent of the program funding in some districts to less than 10 percent in most districts--the willingness of administrators to take directions from federal agencies has also diminished. Over and again we heard

[1] A case in point is the recent Assembly resolution introduced in California only days after the federal announcement that bilingual education would no longer be the required method for instructing language minority children. The resolution asks for a similar reversal of the state bilingual education requirement.

complaints about federal mandates that are not accompanied by the funds to carry them out. This is a key area of conflict between state and federal requirements--the federal government requires things that the state is not willing to, or cannot, pay for. This factor, too, argues for a policy that would consolidate funding and program regulation in a single agency. Yet, total and rapid deregulation of language assistance services by the federal government would undoubtedly have negative consequences as well. There is considerable agreement among those individuals who are relatively sensitive to the politics of education--high-level administrators and school board members--that a rapid retrenchment from regulation on the part of the federal government would send a message to the state and local educational agencies that the U.S. Department of Education now sees language assistance services as having lower priority. Despite differing reactions to the Department's changing role in regulation, there is general agreement that a perceived decrease in federal interest in language assistance programs would result in a similar lower priority for such services on the educational agendas of the states.

Although almost everyone seems to agree that the federal government's policy on language assistance programs affects the attitudes of local regulatory bodies, the degree to which a change in federal policy is likely to affect state or local regulations depends on (1) the general political climate of the state and (2) the amount of controversy that has surrounded a program at the district level. Hence, districts that are located in states with strong language assistance legislation (e.g., Valle) predict a possible shift in attitude within the state, but no immediate effects; the same is true in districts such as Paradise, where there is no state law, but neither is much controversy associated with their program. The greatest effects would be expected in districts like Silver Spur, where there is no state law and a harsh political climate with respect to language assistance, and Frontera, where a state law exists that is constantly being challenged by local districts.

In short, whatever position the Department of Education takes with respect to regulating language assistance programs, its policymakers must be sensitive to the fact that policy will be interpreted at two

levels. The states and local districts will be listening carefully to hear the *intent* of federal policy as well as its overt manifestations.

Assuming that the federal government continues to regulate language assistance services at some level, what form should federal policy take? Given that there is a great deal of disagreement between different sectors of the educational establishment and even different constituents within the same community, and that the responsibility for program funding falls heaviest on the states, is it reasonable to entertain the idea of a single national policy on language assistance programs? We think not. At the same time, we believe the federal government cannot abandon its historic role of protecting the rights of minorities, including the nation's LES/NES children.

The strong belief in this country that education is the key to opportunity must also form a basis for language assistance policy. The right for all children to receive an appropriate education must be upheld both in our laws and in our public understanding. However, the diversity of opinion that is expressed by the various language minority constituent groups points up the difficulty of specifying a single "appropriate" educational program for all children in need of language assistance services. Clearly, the individual children and parents served by these programs should have a voice in determining the appropriate educational goals and strategies for them.

THE FEDERAL ROLE: RECOMMENDATIONS

Our analysis of the data we collected leads us to conclude that the federal role in language assistance services should have two components: *regulation* and *sponsorship of research and technical assistance*.

Regulation

The facts do not support a federal effort to regulate language assistance services comprehensively. Local needs and capacities are too diverse to be covered by a single set of requirements; further, what is possible and desirable for one language group may be impossible for others. For example, districts serving Asian and Native American students often lack the kinds of trained personnel, instructional materials, and curricula that are generally available for

Spanish-speaking students. There is, however, a need for some general federal regulation to put pressure on districts that would prefer to ignore the needs of language minority groups, or that would not take the legitimate needs and desires of their communities into account. Additionally, some form of federal regulation is needed simply because local officials expect it. Many localities that would be willing to improve language minority services have delayed doing so because they wanted to see what the federal government would require.

Based on our findings that (1) multiple factors and interest groups influence the selection and implementation of language assistance programs, (2) the federal government has played an important role in refereeing these interests, especially for small and/or less powerful groups, and (3) even in the best of situations, there are unsatisfactory student-program matches, we offer the following recommendations for the federal role in regulation. The federal government should:

- Require local districts to conduct need and preference assessments of the language minority constituents within their boundaries.
- Require local districts to provide educational *program options* based on an analysis of constituents' needs and desires and district resources.
- Require states to develop effective procedures for language minority constituents to redress grievances associated with language assistance service deficiencies at the state level.
- Maintain consistent pressure on the states to ensure the protection of all civil/educational rights of language minority students.

Sponsorship of Research and Technical Assistance

In view of the existing problems of inadequate materials, resources, assessment, and secondary services, federal aid must be considered a necessary concomitant to regulation. We suggest that the federal government should:

- Provide seed money, as is done through Title VII, to establish new programs, upgrade secondary programs, and support the development of qualified professional staff.
- Develop, and encourage the development of, language assessment materials for use with all language minority students.
- Help districts to identify texts and other materials that can be used for different language groups.
- Support research on ways to provide an adequate curriculum for diverse language minority students.

Finally, we recommend that at all levels of the educational structure, administrators explore the means for fostering more positive attitudes toward language assistance programs. There are some excellent programs that provide enrichment opportunities for English-speaking as well as LES/NES children and in which attendance is a mark of prestige. (See the Appendix, particularly the discussions of Pueblo Historico and Cosmos.) It is our assessment that these programs result from positive language attitudes and high standards of performance on the part of administrators and teachers, and that such a scenario is within the reach of most local districts.

Appendix

DESCRIPTIONS OF STUDY SITES

This appendix presents descriptions of the study sites we investigated. Districts are divided into three groups: rural, suburban, and urban. Information about site demographics and the programs offered at both elementary and secondary levels is provided for each district.

RURAL SITES

We included two rural sites in the study: Valle, located in the West, and Frontera, in a South Central area bordering Mexico. Though similar in size, the two rural sites differ in many other respects. Frontera's enrollment is 95 percent Mexican-American. Valle serves a somewhat more diverse student population: 47 percent of its enrollment is Mexican or Mexican-American; 5 percent is Filipino, Japanese, or Portuguese; and the rest is Anglo.

Valle

Valle encompasses 155 square miles bordering three counties within its state. It includes a small agricultural community, as well as attractive coastal residential developments which attract middle- and upper-income professionals from a nearby town. Migrant farm workers are attracted by the area's agricultural business, which generates much seasonal employment. Intense contrasts characterize the district, and pockets of poverty and high unemployment as well as affluence can be found. During our visit, local residents characterized the small agricultural town within the district's borders as a conservative community, run by landed gentry for 75 years. There was and is in some quarters a feeling of resentment about giving something to people who "come here from Mexico for a short time to make money and then go back."

Twenty-two schools serve approximately 12,500 students. Housing patterns and the neighborhood-school concept segregate many of the district's schools by socioeconomic status and ethnicity. Several

schools currently have 80 percent or greater minority enrollment, three schools have 70 percent, and five have less than 11 percent. Secondary-school Hispanic students are concentrated in the older of the district's two high schools, where they constitute 48 percent of enrollment. The reduced proportional Hispanic student enrollment at the high-school level indicates the group's dropout rate at this level. Our interviewees described desegregation as a major district issue. The district plans to open magnet schools designed to attract students away from their neighborhood schools by next year. Three of the district's seven elected school board members, several lower-level district administrators, and three principals are Mexican-American. Representation by Mexican-Americans on the school board is a relatively new phenomenon; only recently was the first Chicano school board member elected.

There are 3100 LES/NES students attending school in Valle. All but 100 speak English as their primary language. A continuous influx from Mexico has increased the district's Hispanic and LES/NES population.

The district's language assistance program for LES/NES students is based on a philosophy of transition to English, although there is considerable support in some quarters for maintaining the children's home language. Elementary-school-age LES/NES children are given the option of placement in self-contained bilingual classes. We noted a great deal of variation between schools in the language assistance focus. Some schools provide a considerable amount of Spanish language instruction, including instruction *about* the Spanish language, while others deemphasize this in favor of a rapid transition to English. The district's schools are characterized by a high degree of curricular autonomy, which was notable in the diversity of language assistance programs offered.

Non-Spanish-speaking LES/NES children and Spanish-primary-language speakers who opt not to be placed in self-contained bilingual classes are placed in regular classrooms. They receive tutorial assistance in their own language and ESL instruction on a part-time, pull-out basis.

ESL and some subject matter classes are taught in Spanish and English at the secondary-school level. Non-Spanish-speaking LES/NES students may enroll in ESL courses, and some receive peer tutoring.

Frontera

Migrant students make up 30 percent of Frontera's enrollment. Some agricultural activity takes place in the area, but trade between Frontera and the Mexican city directly across the border provides most of the local economy's support. The area's majority culture is Mexican, and Spanish is the majority language. The term "language minority" has no meaning when applied to the area's Spanish-speaking residents. Many of the area's professional elite are Mexican or of Mexican descent. To participate in Frontera's economy it is necessary to speak Spanish, and both Anglos and Hispanics commonly use Spanish in both business and social interaction. The area's residents travel freely and frequently across the border; however, district officials and local residents do not perceive themselves as having an illegal immigration problem.

The school district encompasses approximately 1290 square miles and is the area's largest employer. Twelve schools serve 9900 students, 5500 of whom are LES/NES. Ninety-five percent of the district's enrollment is Mexican or Mexican-American; the rest is Anglo. Five Mexican-Americans serve on the school board. The area's economy is somewhat depressed, and 84 percent of the district's students qualified for a free or reduced-price lunch program last year. During the past five years, enrollment has increased 6 percent per year, and only a small percentage of the students entering the district's schools are English-proficient.

Frontera's proximity to Mexico and immersion in Spanish language and Mexican culture have affected the nature of its LES/NES language assistance programs. Frontera encourages a transition-to-English approach, and both community and school personnel are anxious that children receive sufficient English language experience in the schools. Most community members to whom we spoke expressed a desire for children to learn English so they can enter the economic and educational mainstream outside Frontera's boundaries. There is little concern that students will lose their own language and culture in the process, since models for Spanish language and Mexican culture abound in the community.

At the elementary level, LES/NES students are placed in self-contained bilingual classes. The program emphasizes English language acquisition, with little Spanish maintenance, but the instructional approach varies from teacher to teacher. In most classes, children receive no instruction in Spanish as a second language as part of their curriculum. However, teachers estimate that they deliver subject matter instruction in Spanish between 20 and 50 percent of the day, depending on the students' needs. Teachers attempt to make the transition to all-English instruction by about the third grade.

Secondary-school-age LES/NES students may take a class in the fundamentals of English as part of their course work. Some core classes are taught bilingually, depending on teacher skills and motivation. The class offerings vary from school to school and are not part of the district's formal language assistance program.

SUBURBAN SITES

We included two suburban sites in the study: Condado and Paradise. The suburban communities served by the Condado and Paradise districts have experienced exploding growth in the last decade and have become greatly "urbanized."

Condado

Condado is a western suburban area (city population 189,000) whose growth is due largely to (1) relocation of increasing amounts of industry to the county, (2) suburban expansion caused by an increase in moderately priced housing, and (3) immigration from outside the United States. Immigration has swollen school enrollment and dramatically altered the ethnic composition of the district's students. Total enrollment presently numbers 30,000: 60 percent Hispanic (mostly of Mexican origin), 5 percent black, 12.5 percent Asian (mostly recently resettled Indochinese), and 22.5 percent Anglo-American. Residential segregation concentrates most of the district's Anglo-American students in two elementary schools. The Hispanics and Asians live almost exclusively in the city's older, lower-priced neighborhoods and are dispersed throughout the district's other schools. Although black

students once made up almost 20 percent of the district's enrollment, their proportion has sharply declined during the past five years. At present, no ethnic or racial minority members serve on the school board.

About one-third (10,300) of the school district's students are LES/NES. Approximately 75 percent of the LES/NES students speak Spanish; most of the remainder speak an Indochinese language (Vietnamese, Laotian, Hmong, or Cambodian). The school district estimates that a large percentage of the Spanish-speaking students are recent immigrants from Mexico. The Indochinese students are refugees who have resettled in the area during the past two years. Compared to the Indochinese, the Hispanic immigrants' growth has been gradual. Over 2000 Indochinese refugee children enrolled in Condado in a recent 16-month period, overwhelming the resources for language assistance services. Language assistance services to LES/NES students formally encourage a rapid transition to the English language.

Two separate programs serve the district's LES/NES population. Spanish speakers receive bilingual instruction in self-contained classes. Lessons are given in reading, writing, and speaking English, and children whose primary language is Spanish are taught to read and write first in that language. Teachers use both English and Spanish to deliver subject matter instruction during the early primary grades (K-1). English use increases progressively with grade level. Program administrators target the third grade for transition to all-English instruction. The amount and intensity of instruction in Spanish varies from school to school, depending on the principal's attitude and the teacher's approach.

Non-Spanish (primarily Indochinese language) speakers are placed in an intensive English program. Children receive instruction in English reading, speaking, and writing in self-contained classes, taught by English-speaking teachers. Additional courses specially designed for these newcomers acculturate them to American society, its institutions, its culture, and its mores. The shortage of Indochinese aides who are also fluent in English and the difficulty of working with children from many different language groups and cultures, many of whom have low entry skill levels, challenge instructors.

District personnel perceive several problems within the district's language assistance programs. None of the language assistance services addresses the problem of pupil transiency and midyear entry. The program models assume the student will enter in September of some year at the kindergarten level and will emerge at the end of the second grade with the ability to function in an English-only classroom. School staff feel the district currently lacks a program for the child who moves around in the early years or who enters the system with limited proficiency in the later elementary or secondary grades. Respondents indicated that some school board members resented having to provide language assistance services for LES/NES students. There has been an uneasy accommodation between the board and the bilingual program's director and teachers, since they have not always agreed on the best approach for children whose first language is Spanish.

The district's secondary-level LES/NES students have access to a less structured language assistance program than their elementary-school-age peers. LES/NES students enter a "literacy program." After at least a self-contained literacy class, students are mainstreamed to regular classrooms as they become English-proficient. Upon exiting the self-contained literacy class, they receive ESL instruction as needed.

Paradise

Paradise is located in a Southeastern "Sunbelt" county with approximately 1 million inhabitants. Relocation of people and industries from less temperate climates and immigration from outside the United States (the Caribbean Basin, Mexico, and Central America) have contributed to the area's impressive growth during the past 10 years. Many immigrants from Haiti and Cuba have arrived in the area recently.

The school district currently enrolls about 135,000 students. Their racial composition reflects the county's: approximately 81 percent Anglo, 13 percent black, 5 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Asian and Native American. Of the five school board members, four are Anglo, one Black.

Paradise has the smallest proportion of language minority students among the study's sample sites. About 1400 LES/NES students (slightly over 1 percent of enrollment) attend Paradise's schools.

About 75 percent of the LES/NES population speak Spanish as their primary language; another 13 percent speak Haitian Creole; and 5 percent speak an Asian or Indochinese language. The remaining students speak one of 18 languages, with only two language groups (French and Hebrew) enrolling over 15 students. The language assistance program started in 1977, but the recent Haitian and Cuban refugee influx has led to rapid growth in the past two years. The district serves some migrant children and a few Native American children who do not attend reservation schools. The migrant children receive bilingual services as needed. All the Native American children speak English and receive no special language services.

Several "bilingual centers" scattered throughout the district provide language assistance services to LES/NES students. Center sizes vary from one to 10 classrooms, but they always represent a numerical minority of students at the schools. LES students are assigned to special bilingual centers, often outside their own residential neighborhoods. The district provides bus transportation to the centers as long as the student needs language assistance services. Upon exiting the program, the student is reassigned to his neighborhood school.

Although school sites around the district have a bilingual program, only one school complex offers services for non-Spanish LES/NES students. The complex includes two elementary schools, one junior high school, and one high school. LES/NES students automatically gain admission, but fluent English speakers (FES) must apply. Typically, every grade has a waiting list because people view the complex as academically elite.

The complex houses the district's own innovation research and development center. It includes the most innovative educational services found in Paradise, along with the highest concentration of LES/NES students. The complex's prestige has reversed many of the low-status or remedial assumptions often associated with bilingual education.

Students receive instruction in English in self-contained classes with an average class size of 18 students (one teacher and one aide per classroom); average class size is 15 in the primary grades. LES/NES students are mainstreamed part of the day with regular classes for physical education, art, and music. Depending on the child's English proficiency, he or she may be mainstreamed for science, social studies, or math as well. Full transition into an all-English program occurs after about three years, or when the district's exit criteria are met. For the most part, teachers deliver instruction in English, with extensive explanations in the child's primary language provided by a teacher or aide as available. Primary-grade reading is taught in English only. The low student-teacher ratio allows a high degree of individualization within the program. Teachers report they are able to adjust to midyear entrants without much difficulty.

The district makes no active instructional effort to support the child's primary language; teachers decrease their use of the primary language as English proficiency grows.

The bilingual centers located at other school sites provide language assistance services mainly for children whose primary language is Spanish.

All secondary students in need of language assistance services are taught either at the magnet school or at a bilingual complex. The foreign language magnet school is regarded as academically elite, and bilingual program administrators report this setting encourages valuable exchange between English speakers trying to learn one of the non-English languages spoken by fellow students, and vice versa.

URBAN SITES

We included four urban sites of varying sizes in the study sample: Pueblo Historico, Cosmos, Rancho Grande, and Silver Spur.

Pueblo Historico

With an enrollment of 11,500, Pueblo Historico is the smallest urban district in our sample. Located in a small southwestern city, it

is uniquely steeped in three cultures: Native American, Hispanic, and Anglo. The groups seem to coexist harmoniously; much intermarriage occurs, and few of the ethnic tensions found elsewhere are present in the area. Sixty-three percent of the district's enrollment is Hispanic, reflecting the population of the city and its environs. Tourism contributes significantly to the area's economy.

Some residential segregation exists, and the city's lower-income neighborhoods have higher concentrations of Hispanics. Many of the Anglo residents are recent, relatively well-to-do immigrants drawn to the area by its growing reputation as a center for native arts.

The area's Spanish-surnamed population has preserved its language since the region was under Spain's dominance. Today, the English and Spanish languages and U.S. and Hispanic cultures are mingled in everyday life. Residents consider the area's Spanish language and culture an asset. Anglos immigrating to the area are attracted by its cultural and linguistic heritage. Unlike other southwestern locales, Pueblo Historico views Hispanics as having a legitimate right to political power. School board membership is divided about evenly between Anglos and Hispanics. The district's language assistance programs reflect the area's sociocultural experience.

Only a handful of the district's students are considered LES. Students are more likely to be merely deficient in English. The bilingual program's primary goal is to provide Spanish language maintenance for Hispanic students and an enrichment program that teaches local Hispanic culture and language to Anglos. The Anglo superintendent is well accepted and very supportive of the district's program, and only six of the district's elementary schools lack bilingual education. At the elementary-school level, self-contained bilingual classes are integrated--half of the students enrolled in them are Hispanic, half are Anglos. (In this community, the students' names do not always reflect the parents' ethnicity.) Since the bilingual program seeks to enrich and maintain Spanish language use, teachers use the language in increasing amounts--for example, starting at about 25 percent of the time at the beginning of the first grade and increasing to 50 percent by the end of the year. Of course, Spanish-language use varies greatly

from teacher to teacher, depending on language skills and ability to instruct in Spanish. Given the program's goals, exit is not an issue.

As in other sample sites, fewer options are available for secondary-school-age students. Some core classes are presented bilingually, and at the high-school level, students may take courses in Spanish and Spanish literature as electives.

Cosmos

Cosmos serves a large Great Lakes metropolis currently experiencing significant industry loss, population decline, and demographic shifts. U.S. Census figures indicate that the population declined by almost 100,000 between 1970 and 1980. The city now has approximately 636,000 inhabitants. The school district experienced similar population shifts--its enrollment dropped from 132,000 to 88,000 during the last decade, while the minority student proportion increased substantially. Currently, Blacks constitute 47 percent of school enrollment (exactly twice their proportion in the total city population), Hispanics a little more than 5 percent, Native Americans slightly over 1 percent, Asians slightly under 1 percent, and whites 45 percent.

Area residents are very sensitive about these population shifts. They view them as undermining the city's image as an enclave of white, ethnic, European heritage.

Cosmos has an historical commitment to experimentation in language instruction. Among the district's several innovative language programs is its four-year-old language immersion experiment--first in German, later in French, and more recently in Spanish. Our interviewees described the experiment enthusiastically. Approximately 335 students participate, all at the elementary level, with about 60 percent taking instruction in German. Blacks, who were originally skeptical, now support the immersion program, and classrooms are fully integrated.

In addition, approximately 2200 Hispanic students participate in bilingual/bicultural education programs within the district. Thirteen schools (ten elementary, one middle, two high) comprise the district's program. The bulk of activity is centered at four schools with especially high Hispanic concentrations. The district's desegregation plan exempts these schools in order to maintain the most highly

developed programs. Cosmos' bilingual education program is by definition a program for Hispanics only. As yet, no serious discussion about offering comparable services to smaller language groups has occurred. Space limitations preclude the participation of non-language-handicapped students in all but one elementary-school bilingual program. Non-Hispanics do participate at the high-school level.

Spanish language and Latino culture maintenance is the program's underlying philosophy, and exit from the program is not an issue. Instructional method in elementary-school bilingual classes varies. Bilingual program supervisors have tried to institute an alternative-day approach: English one day, Spanish the next (with new concepts introduced in the native language on all-English days). Teachers have resisted so far, and about 60 percent of the classes currently employ the more traditional language-mixing instructional approach, introducing an idea in English, followed immediately afterward with a Spanish translation, or vice versa.

In addition to immersion and bilingual education, the district provides an extensive ESL program dating back to the late 1950s. As a result of a *Lau* compliance agreement as well as of rising need (due to a recent Asian and Cuban refugee influx), the ESL staff has nearly doubled in the past five years. Instruction takes place at five orientation centers for newly arrived students and at regular schools on a part-time, pull-out basis. The program serves over 700 students: 55 percent speak Spanish as their primary language, 19 percent Southeast Asian languages, and 26 percent a variety of other languages.

Rancho Grande

The Rancho Grande district serves a modern, prosperous city of 800,000 in the south central United States. In the course of its colorful history, the city has been under many flags, including those of France, Spain, Mexico, and the Confederate States of America. Its proximity to Mexico has immersed it in Hispanic culture and language. Area residents conduct commerce, politics, and social interaction in two languages--a sign of historic and other deep-seated links with Mexico.

However, the area has not always been comfortable with its Hispanic past. Previous generations of Hispanic students (mostly of Mexican descent) enrolled in Rancho Grande's schools were not allowed to converse in Spanish on school grounds. This policy was altered in 1968, when the district began to develop its language assistance program for LES/NES students. However, the amount of support that exists for the district's bilingual program is perceived differently by its various participants.

Today, 73 percent of Rancho Grande's 62,000 students are Hispanic, 16 percent Black, and the rest (11 percent) Anglo. Approximately 11,000 LES/NES students attend its schools. The majority of these speak Spanish; a smaller number speak Vietnamese and other tongues. Five out of the seven school board members are Mexican-Americans.

Spanish-speaking LES/NES students have access to self-contained bilingual classes. The program encourages rapid transition to all-English instruction. Teachers deliver instruction in Spanish as long as the student lacks English proficiency. Normally no formal instruction about the Spanish language is included in the curriculum. The instructional approach, however, varies enormously from school to school, and from teacher to teacher, as the bilingual program curriculum is not integrated with the district's regular core curriculum. One board member stated that the program is perceived as "a guest in the district."

Title VII funds pay for a few special services for secondary-level LES/NES students, including an after-school tutorial program and an extracurricular communications program designed to improve students' self-image.

Silver Spur

The Silver Spur district is one of several serving a large southwestern metropolitan urban area (population 500,000) whose population has increased substantially in recent years, following the relocation of a number of industries into the area. Fifty-six thousand students presently attend Silver Spur's schools, a reduction of 4000 over the last three years.

Approximately 30 percent of Silver Spur's enrollment is Hispanic, 5 percent Black, 2 percent Native American or Asian, and the rest (63 percent) Anglo. The district's minority population is generally dispersed geographically; however, several schools have high LES/NES (primarily Hispanic) student concentrations. The district alleges not to know specifically how many students receive services or how many actually need them. Though the area is relatively close to Mexico, Spanish language and the Mexican culture have not been respected here. Previous generations of LES/NES school children remember being punished for speaking Spanish on school grounds.

Approximately 1700 LES/NES students enrolled in Silver Spur's schools last year. The district's language assistance services vary tremendously from school to school, as a result of a number of factors: First, the board has not taken a public position on language assistance programs. Second, these programs have a low priority in Silver Spur, in part due to more immediate concerns about school desegregation, administrative shake-ups, and budget deficits facing the district. Third, principals have much autonomy and can shape their schools' language assistance services to agree with their personal philosophy vis-a-vis LES/NES students.

Some schools with high concentrations of Spanish-speaking LES/NES students provide self-contained bilingual classes. These programs encourage a rapid transition to all-English language instruction. According to teachers interviewed, the use of Spanish is most intensive in grades K-2. The use of English for instruction increases by the third grade.

Students from non-Spanish-speaking backgrounds and Spanish-speaking students enrolled in schools with high concentrations of fluent English speakers are mainstreamed into regular classes. They receive ESL instruction on a part-time, pull-out basis. Black children with linguistic problems receive special ESL-like services from floating teachers who specialize in Standard English as a Second Dialect.

Members of two Native American tribes attend the district's schools. Students from one tribe are regarded as "Hispanicized" and are counted as Hispanics in the district's ethnic survey. They are placed

in bilingual self-contained classes during their elementary-school years. Some staff members pointed out that though these children understand Spanish, many of them are fluent in their own Indian dialect at the time of school entry. The district does not address this formally in its language assistance program, although several teachers and aides who speak the Indian language have been assigned to schools with concentrations of Native American students. The Native American students from the other tribes receive no language assistance services, unless they happen to be in a class with a teacher who speaks their own language.

Secondary-school-age LES/NES students have few services available to them. Language assistance services for this group are limited to ESL courses and some subject matter classes that are taught bilingually, depending on teacher availability and principal's philosophy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carpenter-Huffman, Polly, and Marta Samulon, *Case Studies of Delivery and Cost of Bilingual Education,* The Rand Corporation, N-1684-ED, April 1981.

Education Daily, Vol. 13, No. 199, October 10, 1980, p. 2.

Hunter, Marjorie, "U.S. Education Chief Bars Bilingual Plan for Public Schools," *The New York Times,* February 3, 1981.

Kimbrough, Jackie, and Paul T. Hill, *The Aggregate Effects of Federal Education Programs,* The Rand Corporation, R-2638-ED, September 1981.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 1974.

Mackey, William F., "The Evaluation of Bilingual Education," in B. Spolsky and R. L. Cooper, *Frontiers of Bilingual Education,* Newbury House, Rowley, Massachusetts, 1977.

Mattingly, Jane, *1978-79 Bilingual Education Survey,* Education Commission of the States, Education Finance Center, Denver, Colorado, September 1979.

Otheguy, Ricardo, "Thinking About Bilingual Education: A Critical Appraisal," *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 52, No. 3, August 1982.

Rotberg, Iris, "Some Legal and Research Considerations in Establishing Federal Policy in Bilingual Education," *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 52, No. 2, May 1982.

Stanfield, Rochelle, "Are Federal Bilingual Rules a Foot in the Schoolhouse Door?" *National Journal,* October 10, 1980.

Summer, Gerald, and Gail Zellman, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VI: Implementing and Sustaining Title VII Bilingual Projects,* The Rand Corporation, R-1589/6-HEW, January 1977.

U.S. Department of Education, "Proposed Rules," *Federal Register,* Vol. 45, No. 152, August 5, 1980.